

IN THE
Court of Appeal of the State of California

IN AND FOR THE
Fifth Appellate District

- F057485** **People v. Cartwright**
Counsel having failed to request oral argument in the above-entitled case, oral argument is deemed waived in accordance with the provisions of a notice heretofore mailed to counsel and the cause is submitted.
- F056864** **Rios et al. v. Holland**
The judgment is affirmed. Ardaiz, P.J.
We concur: Levy, J.; Hill, J.
[NOT TO BE PUBLISHED IN OFFICIAL REPORTS]
- F057118** **People v. Wandick**
Oral argument having been waived in the above-entitled case in accordance with the provisions of a notice mailed to counsel, the calendar date heretofore set is vacated and the case is submitted for decision.
- F057118** **People v. Wandick**
The judgment is affirmed.
By the Court.
[NOT TO BE PUBLISHED IN OFFICIAL REPORTS]
- F057173** **People v. Carrillo**
The judgment is affirmed.
By the Court.
[NOT TO BE PUBLISHED IN OFFICIAL REPORTS]
- F057608** **W.T. v. K.M**
Counsel having failed to request oral argument in the above-entitled case, oral argument is deemed waived in accordance with the provisions of a notice heretofore mailed to counsel and the cause is submitted.
- F055817** **DeSantis, et al. v. Bilello & Costa Trading, Inc. et al.**
Respondent's petition for rehearing filed herein is denied.

IN THE
Court of Appeal of the State of California

IN AND FOR THE
Fifth Appellate District

F056514 **People v. Swain**

The judgment is reversed and remanded with directions to the trial court to hold proceedings and to resolve the issue of whether the People can prove a factually based justification for treating SVP's differently than MDO's and NGI's. Wiseman, Acting P.J.

We concur: Dawson, J.; Kane, J.

[NOT TO BE PUBLISHED IN OFFICIAL REPORTS]

F056634 **People v. Ruiz**

Oral argument having been waived in the above-entitled case in accordance with the provisions of a notice mailed to counsel, the case is submitted for decision.

F056506 **Galbiso v. Orosi Public Utility District**

The judgment is affirmed. Costs on appeal are awarded to OPUD. Kane, J.

We concur: Wiseman, Acting P.J.; Dawson, J.

[CERTIFIED FOR PUBLICATION]

F057619 **In re M.M., a Minor**

Oral argument having been waived in the above-entitled case in accordance with the provisions of a notice mailed to counsel, the case is submitted for decision.

F057180 **People v. Smith**

Oral argument having been waived in the above-entitled case in accordance with the provisions of a notice mailed to counsel, the case is submitted for decision.

IN THE
Court of Appeal of the State of California

IN AND FOR THE
Fifth Appellate District

F057891 **In re M.G., a Minor**

The judgment is affirmed with modifications.

By the Court.

[NOT TO BE PUBLISHED IN OFFICIAL REPORTS]

F057357 **City of Patterson v. Stanislaus County et al.; PCCP West Park, LLC et al.**

The appeal is dismissed. The parties should bear their own costs.
The request for judicial notice filed on September 25, 2009, is denied.
Wiseman, Acting P.J.

I concur: Dawson, J.;

I concur: Kane, J. in the judgment only.

[NOT TO BE PUBLISHED IN OFFICIAL REPORTS]

F056602 **People v. Soto**

Oral argument having been waived in the above-entitled case in
accordance with the provisions of a notice mailed to counsel, the case
is submitted for decision.

IN THE

Court of Appeal of the State of California

IN AND FOR THE

Fifth Appellate District

F059067 M.L. v. The Superior Court Of Tulare County; Tulare County Health And Human Services Agency

The petition for extraordinary writ is dismissed. This opinion is final forthwith as to this court.

By the Court.

[NOT TO BE PUBLISHED IN OFFICIAL REPORTS]

F058632 People v. Rios

No brief having been filed by appellant after notice duly given under rule 8.220(a)(1) of the California Rules of Court, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that the appeal in the above-entitled action is dismissed.

F058616 Davis v. Murberger

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that the matter in the above-entitled action is remanded to the superior court with directions to file the complaint. This order is not intended to limit the defendant's ability to act under CCP section 391.1.